



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/585,441 06/02/00 PARK

J 8733.20113

LONG ALDRIDGE & NORMAN LLP  
701 PENNSYLVANIA AVE NW  
WASHINGTON DC 20004

MMC1/0222

EXAMINER

PRASAD, C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2839

DATE MAILED:

02/22/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trad marks

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/585,441

Applicant(s)

PARK ET AL.

Examiner

Chandrika Prasad

Art Unit

2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 5 and 18-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5 and 18-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 6/2/00 is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

**Attachment(s)**

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. The reply filed on 2/13/01 consists of deletion of all original claims 1-17 except 5, addition of new claims 18-31, amendments to Claim 5, changes to the specification and remarks related to rejection of claims. The claims are not allowable as explained below.

### ***Drawings***

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the following must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claims 18-31. No new matter should be entered.

- ✓ • Shell
  - An elongated first body
  - An elongated second body

### ***Specification***

3. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 18-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to

Art Unit: 2839

reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The independent claims 18, 23 and 28 contain the following items, which have not been described in the specification.

- Elongated first body
- Elongated second body
- shell
- arms
- snap-fit arms

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 5, 23-25 and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmitt, Jr. in view of Maejima.

Schmitt (Figures 3-7) shows a device 92 for connecting an electrode 86 to a wire 30. The device has an elongated body with a crimping portion 108 for crimping to the wire and a crimping portion with a hole and snap-fit arms 106 perpendicular to the arms of the crimping portion 108 for crimping to the electrode. But Schmitt does not show crimping portion 108 having a pair of arms for crimping to the wire and the core of the wire. The use of a pair of arms to crimp a wire and its core is well known in the art of

Art Unit: 2839

electrical connectors. Maejima (Figures 2 and 5) shows wires W1, W2 having a conductive core and an exterior sheath and a terminal (clamp) having arms 27 crimped to the core, and arms 19 crimped on the sheath of the wires. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to provide the pair of arms to the crimping portion 108 for crimping to the wire 30 and its core because this would secure the wire and its core to the device 92 as shown by Maejima and well known in the art of electrical connectors.

8. Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmitt, Jr. and Maejima in view of Applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA).

Schmitt and Maejima shows all the features of these claims as described in Paragraph 7 above except crimping of the shell, which contains the electrode, 86. Schmitt shows the crimping of the electrode 86 instead of the shell. If the hole in the crimping portion 102 is made large enough, it could be used to crimp the shell. AAPA (Figures 1-2 of the instant invention) shows the crimping of the shell 2 having the electrode 8. Crimping the shell instead of the electrode is considered an alternate design as shown by AAPA because both serve the same purpose, i.e., to secure the electrode.

9. Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmitt, Jr., Maejima and AAPA as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Murphy.

Schmitt, Maejima and AAPA show all the features of these claims as described in Paragraph 8 above except soldering of the wire core to the device. The use of soldering

Art Unit: 2839

is well known in the art of electrical connectors. Murphy (Figures 4-6) shows the use of solder S in connecting wires to a terminal. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to solder the Schmitt wire 30 to the device near the crimping portion because it would provide a permanent connection as shown by Murphy.

10. Claims 26, 27, 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmitt, Jr. and Maejima as applied to claims 23 and 28 above, and further in view of Murphy.

Schmitt and Maejima show all the features of these claims as described in Paragraph 7 above except soldering of the wire core to the device. The use of soldering is well known in the art of electrical connectors. Murphy (Figures 4-6) shows the use of solder S in connecting wires to a terminal. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to solder the Schmitt wire 30 to the device near the crimping portion because it would provide a permanent connection as shown by Murphy.

### ***Conclusion***

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 2839

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

***Response to Arguments***

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 5 and 18-31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.


***Contact Information***

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chandrika Prasad whose telephone number is (703) 308-0977. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Sircus, can be reached at (703) 308-3119. The fax number for this Group is (703) 308-7722. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or processing should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1782.



Chandrika Prasad

February 20, 2001



Kheim Nguyen  
Primary Examiner